



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/811,718	03/19/2001	Jay Paul Drummond	D-1120 R2	2928
28995	7590	07/09/2010		
RALPH E. JOCKE Walker & Jocke 231 SOUTH BROADWAY MEDINA, OH 44256			EXAMINER FELTEN, DANIEL S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3693	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/09/2010 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/811,718  
Filing Date: March 19, 2001  
Appellant(s): DRUMMOND ET AL.

---

Ralph E. Jocke  
(Reg. No. 31,029)  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the Order Returning Undocketed Appeal to the Examiner filed 09/18/2009 ordering to Vacate the Examiner's Answer mailed 05/29/2009 and Substitute the following Examiner's Answer to correct the deficiencies in the Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal and the supporting arguments.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

5,933,816	ZEANAH et al	8-1999
5,221,838	GUTMAN et al	6-1993

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The 35 USC § 112 Rejection in the Office Action mailed January 13, 2003 is hereby  
WITHDRAWN. The following rejection(s) remains below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all  
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25 and 44-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over  
ZEANAH et al (US 5,933, 816) in view of GUTMAN et al (US 5,221,838).

ZEANAH et al discloses a system for connecting transactions services to an automated transaction machine ("ATM") that includes a network (see Abstract). transaction services are operative to the register with the lookup service and to upload a service proxy to the lookup service. The user interface service is operative to locate transaction services on the network by invoking a remote lookup method on the lookup service (see transaction executor component, col. 14, 11.42 to col. 15, 11. 10).

ZEANAH further discloses the fact that the lookup service is operative to return service proxies that match the type of service that is required. The user interface service is further operative to invoke methods of the service proxies that remotely control the functionality of the

transaction services on the network. The user interface service is further operative to register events with the service proxies for notification when certain events on the services occur (see external service provider interface, col. 15, 11. 12-51).

ZEANAH et al fails to show a printer service, card reader service, and a cash dispenser service. GUTMAN discloses a printer for printing checks, a card reader for reading, and a means for making cash transactions. *It would have been obvious for an artisan of ordinary skill at the time of the invention of ZEANAH to integrate/substitute the GUTMAN system (electronic wallet) into the system of ZEANAH (personal computer--18 and/or PDA--20) because an artisan of ordinary skill at the time of the invention of ZEANAH would have recognized the convenience in the combination of features provided by the GUTMAN invention, inasmuch as each of the notoriously old and well known features provided by GUTMAN would have been sought after in making conventional automated electronic and/or cash transactions.* Thus to integrate/substitute the GUTMAN system into the ZEANAH et al would have been an obvious expedient well within the ordinary skill in the art.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

The Appellant asserts on page 11 of the Brief that there is no suggestion of connecting a transaction service in a host automated machine, where the transaction service includes a transaction function device and the host automated transaction machine includes a lookup service. ZEANAH et al discloses, a system for connecting transactions services to an automated transaction machine ("ATM") that includes a network (see Abstract). transaction services are operative to the register with the lookup service and to upload a service proxy to the lookup

service. The user interface service is operative to locate transaction services on the network by invoking a remote lookup method on the lookup service (see transaction executor component, col. 14, 11.42 to col. 15, 11.10).

Zeanah further discloses the fact that the lookup service is operative to return service proxies that match the type of service that is required. The user interface service is further operative to invoke methods of the service proxies that remotely control the functionality of the transaction services on the network. The user interface service is further operative to register events with the service proxies for notification when certain events on the services occur (see external service provider interface, col. 15, lines 12-51). In particular, ZEANAH discloses an external service provider interface services set (100) which provides protocol support for interfacing with external service providers. The external service provider interface provides a service proxy (or back door man component that is used as a lookup table inasmuch as the back door man component is routes incoming messages to a *registered* or well-known system component. Or at least it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time ZEANAH would recognize the back door component has providing the functional equivalent of a look-up table as a the back-door component requires a table (or look-up) of registered components to route and/or manage messages as the look up table.

GUTMAN was used as an interface disclosing a printer for printing checks, a card reader for reading, and a means for making cash transactions(see fig. 1). It is thus maintained that it would have been obvious for an artisan of ordinary skill wallet) into the system of Zeanah (personal computer--18 and/or PDA--20) because an artisan of ordinary skill at the time of the invention of Zeanah would have recognized the convenience in the combination of features

provided by the Gutman invention, inasmuch as each of the notoriously old and well known features provided by Gutman would have been sought after in making conventional automated electronic and/or cash transactions. Thus to integrate/substitute the Gutman system into the Zeanah et al would have been an obvious expedient well within the ordinary skill in the art.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S Felten/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3693

Conferees:

---

Vincent Millin/vm/  
Appeals Practice Specialist

/James A. Kramer/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3693